



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dr. Forsyth's literary quality is his incessant brilliancy or cleverness, his pungent epigrams, his telling phrases. They are striking but often they are irritating, because incongruous with the mood of the theme.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
MEADVILLE, PA.

ANGLICAN DISCUSSIONS ON DOCTRINE AND CHURCH UNION

Two books written by three clergymen of the Church of England will be of most direct interest to members of that communion, but of much interest, too, to all Christian thinkers, for the problems they consider are common to all Christians and pressing upon all who are called Protestant, evangelical or reformed. One of these books¹ consists of a written debate between Dr. W. Sanday, the famous New Testament professor of Oxford, and Mr. N. P. Williams, chaplain-fellow of Exeter College of the same university. The thesis of Dr. Sanday is that the content of Christian tradition—that is, the substance of the great historic creeds—is continuous, permanent, and true, while the form—that is, not only the words but the concepts which they express—are to some extent temporary and must be superseded. Mr. Williams affirms the unchangeable character of both form and content. The discussion is opened by a paper setting forth Dr. Sanday's views. This is followed by Mr. Williams' answer, and so the discussion continues until each has written three papers.

Dr. Sanday's statement of the principle of the modernist is interesting and probably as good as could be made by the many men who feel bound to accept the truths revealed in modern science and thought and at the same time are required by the rules of their church to assent to ancient and fixed symbols. He says on page 13:

The principle which enables our young men to accept the Creeds is that which I have had in view throughout this paper, the principle of the *relativity of expression*. They believe that the creeds are true, not so much in the minute technical detail which was in men's minds at the time when they were composed, as on broad spiritual lines. They would not deny the technical details; they believe that they all had a certain relative rightness in the periods

¹ *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition*. A Friendly Discussion between W. Sanday and N. P. Williams. New York: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1916. xv+167 pages. \$2.00 net.

that understood and could assimilate them; they are perfectly ready to believe that the good Providence of God presided over the whole evolution. But they none the less believe that God has "provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

The usefulness of such a formula is so great at the present time that one can overlook the absurdity of saying, "I believe *a* and *b* and *c*, etc. (only some of these things I don't *really* believe, although I wouldn't on any account deny them)," since the conditions which the formula meets are as absurd as the formula.

Dr. Sanday holds (p. 42) that the questions relating to the meta-physical nature of the Godhead "are rightly answered in the words of the Creeds." The sharpest conflict between his position and that of Mr. Williams, so far as the *matter* of the creeds is concerned, is with regard to historical or supposed historical events. "The Virgin Birth, the physical Resurrection and physical Ascension are all realistic expressions," he says on p. xiii, "adapted to the thought of the time, of ineffable truths which the thought of the time could not express in any other way." The truths, then, which these expressions were intended to set forth are for Dr. Sanday "ineffable," and he would not affirm them as historical facts in this form, or deny them, since they still stand for *truths*. But Mr. Williams insists that they are either historical facts just as they stand, or they are not; they are either true or false with no possible third position, and for him they are absolutely and literally true.

The interest of this discussion would warrant a much longer account than our space will permit. But reference must be made to the distinctive feature of Mr. Williams' argument in which he begs the whole question by claiming an "intuition" that these creeds are true in every detail on account of the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit in their formation. He affirms (p. 32) his belief "in the immanent personal presence of God the Holy Ghost in the Catholic Church . . . inspiring the whole nexus of dogmatic development so intimately and pervasively that each doctrine, as it took shape, assumed precisely that *form* which the Holy Spirit foresaw would most perfectly preserve the essential *content* till the end of time." The assumption of this belief, he says (p. 38 and elsewhere), "rests upon an intuition," and (p. 162), he says: "Of course, I quite admit that this 'intuition' or 'categorical imperative' constitutes a valid argument only for me and others who are conscious of it. I cannot really argue with anyone who altogether repudiates possessing it, nor do I pretend to be able to prove to such a one that he

ought to possess it." This position, amazing as it is pitiful in one who manifests otherwise a remarkably clear and frank power of thought, expression, and logical analysis, would consistently preclude his argument with Dr. Sanday or anyone else who differed with him on just the points under discussion, since he claims an immediate intuition that the traditional position which he defends is absolutely correct, and renounces any power or ambition to prove the correctness of this intuition. There is this advantage in his assertion, that it makes explicit what probably underlies the faith or supposed faith of a multitude of his brethren in the Anglican as well as in the Catholic churches. The obvious answer to his position is that his assumption bears none of the marks of an intuition and has all of the characteristics of an induction made from insufficient premises. The intuition which Mr. Williams thinks he has of the "infallibility of the church" has no meaning or value except as carefully *defined*. The *details* involved in such a definition are evidently justified, if at all, by *history*, and are inconceivable as the products of intuition. His "intuition" then, that a certain body, defined in terms and by data furnished by history, is in certain historical actions infallible, i.e., absolutely correct and unable to be otherwise than correct, is the most astonishing compound that an intelligent man could think of calling by that name. And if there be any conceivable tests of the truth of the various details of the creeds, which Mr. Williams' "intuition" perceives to be divinely formulated, other than the "intuition" itself—and this Mr. Williams explicitly acknowledges, at least in the matter of the assertion of events in human history, such as the virgin birth—we have the anomalous situation of an "intuition" (equivalent in value and self-evident character to an axiom) which would be instantly disproved by certain very *conceivable* facts of history, if they should be discovered. Such an intuition is indeed a very unsubstantial foundation for such a heavy superstructure.

Mr. Williams feels, as a result of his careful analysis of Dr. Sanday's *words*, that they are not far apart in their views at the close of the discussion. This optimistic conclusion seems explicable only through his failure to comprehend the immense difference in *ideas* which the words expressed. Dr. Sanday admits "we have not yet succeeded in reaching very much common ground" (p. x). Nevertheless the discussion may be very valuable indeed if it will help Anglican clergymen or others to indulge in the distasteful occupation of thinking.

An opponent, less gentle than Dr. Sanday to the extremes of "high church" doctrine and principle, is found in William Leighton Grane,

prebendary of Chichester. He has written a strong book¹ on the evils of the present condition of disunion among the fragments of the Christian church and the urgent necessity and proper methods of bringing about reunion. Mr. Grane finds a vital relation between "the disunion in the Christian Church and the fierce fighting in the nominally Christian world," the latter to furnish a new and great motive for the changing of the former condition. "The Church's Founder" he says (p. 6), "made fundamental the principle of putting first things first. Early Christendom adhered to that principle and remained one. Later Christendom did not, and became divided." The remedy, then, is to return to the earlier condition or spirit of putting first things first, of valuing the unseen more than the seen, the spiritual more than the material or formal.

Mr. Grane writes in the first place for Anglicans. They have long been lamenting the sin of schism—on the part of *other* Christians. They have generally, in recent years, stood out *against* any movement or tendency which would help to bring them into closer accord with other *Protestant* churches, on the principle that that would separate them the more from the Roman and Greek Catholic churches, which were at the same time *larger* bodies of Christians than any of the Protestant groups, and also were parts of the true, original, historic Catholic church, as the Church of England itself was, whereas nonconforming Protestants were mere schismatics, to whose organizations the very name of "church" should be denied. That this interpretation of the situation, although perhaps largely true from the standpoint of outward historical organization, is false when one considers the vital and spiritual elements involved, the author makes clear in a careful argument, based both on undeniable historical facts and on spiritual principles.

There is at present no hope for reunion of the Anglican church with either the Greek or the Roman Catholic bodies, on account of the doctrines and principles of the latter two organizations. The doctrine of the infallibility of the pope, promulgated in the Vatican Council of 1870, put the finishing touch upon the barriers which the Roman church has for many centuries been building against all other organizations. The *authorities* of this body have never shown the slightest sympathy with any movements toward the reunion of Christendom other than complete submission to their own claims and sway. In 1849, Emperor Nicholas, speaking for the *Eastern* church, said: "The true Faith survives in

¹ *Church Divisions and Christianity*. By William Leighton Grane. New York: Macmillan, 1916. xii+293 pages. \$2.00.

Russia only; in the West it is utterly lost," and in the *Constructive Quarterly* for March, 1913, Archbishop Platon, of the Greek Orthodox church in America, wrote: "Though it might seem that no church is closer to the Orthodox than is the Roman Catholic, yet the distance between them . . . is almost immeasurable."

If Anglicans would accept this abundantly proved fact that at present reunion with either of these two "Catholic" bodies on any other terms than submission and absorption is impossible, they would take a long step toward the possibility of a reunion of reformed Christendom, which itself might be the strongest force to bring about a change of attitude on the part of the "Catholic" bodies. That a union of Protestant Christians is not only the *first* step, but would be of immense significance even from the standpoint of numbers, is proved by the figures given by Mr. Grane in his chapter on "Anglican Opportunity." Comparing available statistics for 1700 with those for 1900, we find that Greek church adherents had grown from 33 to 128 millions; Roman, from 90 to 242 millions, but adherents of the reformed churches (Protestants) from 32 to 520 millions. These figures certainly indicate a far greater vitality on the part of the Protestant communions—which should have some *spiritual* significance—and show that a united Protestant church, if it should be realized, would include the large majority of Christians and thus have at least *some* better claim to the name "Catholic" than the Greek or Roman bodies.

The only thing for the Anglican church to *do*, then, to promote unity is to use all available means for the reunion of *Protestant* Christendom. The current ideas most hostile to the growth of spiritual fellowship, and hence unity, between members of the Anglican church and other reformed churches, Mr. Grane finds to be, (1) "the idea that Anglican discipline requires the banning of adult Christians from participation in the Eucharist except they be confirmed; and (2) the idea that Episcopacy was in such manner instituted at the first as to preclude Churches without Bishops in one of the recognized successions from being accounted Churches at all." (p. 154). The author gives a careful and convincing argument that both these ideas are historically false and spiritually un-Christian. He is too much of an Anglican to admit the conceivability that the episcopal system itself may be one of the causes of the bigotry and narrowness in the Episcopal church which has encouraged, when it has not forced, true Christians to found and maintain other and non-Episcopal organizations. But he powerfully insists that the fruits of the spirit, to be found as well in nonconforming as in Episcopal communions,

are ample proofs of the presence in them of the Spirit of Christ, and hence of the existence of his body, the church.

The primary means for the reunion of Protestant (and indeed *all*) bodies of Christians is suggested in the principle of "putting first things first," the inner before the outer, the spirit before the form of organization. The central doctrine and foundation of Christianity is belief that God is love. The author quotes from the *Episcopal Charge* of the Bishop of Carlisle in 1916, wherein the Bishop speaks of the glorious ideal of true catholicity—the catholicity of Christ: "The primary facts in Christianity are the Fatherhood of God, redemption through Christ, goodness through the Holy Ghost, and the universal brotherhood of men. Let us teach these things, preach these truths, live these realities."

Mr. Grane's book is splendid in literary style and overwhelmingly convincing in argument. Much of it has its principal interest for the Episcopal churches in England and English-speaking countries, but its central appeal is fitted to move all Christians, and to move them toward the true unity of the spirit which will sooner or later show itself in the outward forms of federation or corporate union.

E. ALBERT COOK

HOWARD UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

A NEW BOOK ON NIETZSCHE

The author of a new book on Nietzsche¹ is a Cambridge (England) scholar, with a dozen books to his credit. He lectured at Harvard in 1911 and at the General Theological Seminary, New York, in 1913. This volume comprises lectures delivered in May, 1915, at Lake Forest College (Illinois) on the Bross Foundation.

America needs all the Nietzsche books it will read, provided they truly set forth the philosophical forerunner of the atrocious war and sound the counter-charge; provided they *lay* the Nietzschean devils they raise. One regrets that it was thought advisable, in a then neutral country, to say almost nothing of Nietzsche's relation to the war, which mainly drew attention to him—a relation Dr. Figgis at once recognizes and veils under the familiar Sir Christopher Wren epitaph, "Circumspice."

The book is poorly named; one reaches page 288 before learning that the title is meant to describe Christ's gospel rather than Nietzsche's.

¹ *The Will to Freedom; or the Gospel of Nietzsche and the Gospel of Christ*. By John Neville Figgis. New York: Scribner, 1917. xiii+320 pages. \$1.25.